

**From:** Wayne Hedberg  
**To:** Dale Harber  
**Date:** 1/26/2005 11:52:12 AM  
**Subject:** Re: UTU-68082 Lease Mod Comments, 1-18-05.doc

Dale,

Thanks for your comments on the IBC. We have evaluated your comments (listed below) and have prepared responses (***bold & italicized text***). I trust that these response will satisfy your concerns. We would like to forward our remaining deficiencies and Technical Analysis document (i.e., the hydro monitoring requirement and the right of entry requirement-*signed lease confirmation*) to Dave Shavers by tomorrow, so he can get started on his response immediately. We spoke with him about the additional water monitoring requirement already and he seemed OK with it. He wants to have a response back to us by next week to have everything addressed by the time the final decision on the IBC appeal is made. Joe Helfrich is the new lead on the IBC to replace Gregg Galecki. He is also lead reviewer of the South Crandall lease mod. If you have any questions or remaining concerns regarding the IBC, please contact me (538-5286) or Joe (538-5290) ASAP.

Thanks,  
 Wayne

USFS Comments:

1. A spring/seep and stream water monitoring plan must be discussed in the Mine Plan Amendment that is site specific to the 120 acre lease modification and surrounding area. Several springs/seeps that are discussed in the EA should be monitored, as should Shingle Canyon. The monitoring plan should discuss the types of data to be collected (analytes, volumetric measurements), times of the year monitoring will be performed (frequency), and the approximate number of years that monitoring will be performed.

***The permittee needs to include a water monitoring plan for Shingle Creek that includes, at a minimum, quarterly monitoring for flow and field parameters of spring sites SP-18 and SP-22 and a stream site for Shingle Creek located just downstream of spring site SP-18 and the confluence of the left and right forks of Shingle Creek. The permittee needs to include the water monitoring sites in Plate 7-12 as identified in the water monitoring plan for Shingle Creek.***

2. Chapter 5, Page 5-26b, third paragraph.  
 Projected subsidence is not shown on Plate 5-2(H); it only states that there will be no subsidence where overburden is less than 300 feet. A blue line should be drawn on Plate 5-2(H) showing the projected subsidence area based upon the best available data.

***The projected subsidence for the Hiawatha seam is shown on Plate 5-2 (H). Because of the speculative nature of the coal, the permittee has only shown projected subsidence for the first panel to be mined. Plate 5-2 (H) will be modified as the Permittee learns more about the feasibility of actually mining the coal as they proceed with mining and exploration activities into the 120 acre lease modification area.***

3. Chapter 6, Page 6-11, Section 6.32, last sentence.
  - a. The reference to Plate 5-2(BC) should be deleted since the Blind Canyon seam will not be mined in the 120 acre lease modification.

***The wording on page 6-11 is designed to go into the approved MRP and is not meant to be a stand alone document. Plate 5-2 (BC) shows where mining will take place in the Blind Canyon Seam. The maps for the Blind Canyon seam in the approved MRP and the proposed map found in the proposed South Crandall lease modification, both show that no mining will take place in the 120-acre IBC. Map 5-5 shows projected subsidence over the entire Crandall Canyon mine permit***

***area. This map will be updated as part of the South Crandall lease modification.***

b. Comment 2 (above), regarding projected subsidence, also applies here

***See previous comment above under #2.***

**CC:** Joe Helfrich; karl boyer; Pam Grubaugh-Littig